DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 830 SO 023 238

TITLE Prospects for Further Engagement: A Report of Results of the OAH Survey on International Resource Exchanges.
INSTITUTION Organization of American Historians, Bloomington, IN.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 48p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Nationals; Government Role; Higher Education; *History Instruction; *International Educational Exchange; Primary Sources; *Research Opportunities; Resource Materials; Student Exchange Programs; United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Americanists; Historians; *Organization of American Historians

ABSTRACT

This document reports survey results providing data and ideas for evaluating possible Organization of American Historians (OAH) international initiatives. The survey was constructed to address a wide range of issues and to solicit information on those resources that Americanists worldwide either wish to receive or have to offer. It sought information on existing structures for resource exchanges and on the roles that foreign governments and the U.S. government play in supporting Americanists' scholarship abroad. The survey was mailed to scholars, institutions, and OAH members worldwide whose work focused on U.S. history. The purpose of the survey was to determine the interest in and prospects for international exchanges of people, ideas, and materials. Americanists who responded to the survey almost uniformly expressed interest in one or more of the possible avenues of international exchange. Foreign respondents reported that they view exchanges primarily as an opportunity to obtain access to resources that could enhance their research, their teaching, and their institution's or program's curriculum. U.S. scholars want broader perspectives and fresh insights. Both foreign and domestic responses reflect a desire for access to outside perspectives, for experiences that can widen or reshape the framework of historical inquiry. The report is divided into four sections discussing: (1) the purpose and promise of international engagement; (2) scholar exchanges including travel abroad, receiving visitors from abroad, obstacles to exchange, and imagined alternatives; (3) exchanges of ideas through conferences and collaborative research; and (4) exchanges of materials, resources needed, models for exchanges, and resources offered. The survey itself is appended. (DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 370 830

Prospects for Further Engagement:

A Report of Results of the OAH Survey on International Resource Exchanges

April 1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ARNITA A. JONES
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 023 238

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Report Outline

Executive Summary

I. The Purpose and Promise of International Engagement

II. Scholar Exchanges

- Travel Abroad
- Receiving Visitors from Abroad
- Obstacles to Exchange
- Imagined Alternatives

III. Exchanges of Ideas

- Conferences
- Collaborative Research

IV. Exchanges of Materials

- Material Resources Needed
- Possible Models for Material Exchanges
- Resources Offered

Appendices

Executive Summary:

A Report of the Results of the OAH Survey on International Resource Exchanges

Substantial interest exists both here and abroad in expanding opportunities for international engagement. Scholars believe international exchanges will enrich their practices of history in a variety of ways--by providing them access to primary source materials, by improving the teaching resources available to their students, by advancing intercultural dialogues on the practice of history, and by simply expanding their intellectual horizons. Resource exchanges between Americanists will serve a diverse set of needs among exchange participants. This final section will review briefly the suggested models for international resource exchanges in the context of possible OAH activities and initiatives. Which models of exchange are the most promising? What role do respondents envision the OAH playing in the area of international resource exchanges? Are there current programs or structures that the OAH should investigate?

1) Clearinghouse Activities

By far the most commonly suggested role for the OAH would be to serve as a clearinghouse for exchange opportunities of all types. Such a clearinghouse function might be accomplished through a combination of print and electronic media. The various aspects of a single OAH clearinghouse are described below:

a) Scholarly Exchange Opportunities: The clearinghouse would gather information on specific exchange proposals from individuals and institutions around the globe. The types of opportunities it would register would include proposed person-to-person exchanges of houses and cars for the summer, inter-museum exchanges of visiting curatorships, inter-department exchanges of faculty for a term, etc. The clearinghouse could publish opportunities on a regular basis and let Americanists establish contacts themselves or attempt to facilitate contact between Americanists.

b) Joint Research Projects: The clearinghouse would gather and publish information on individual scholars interested in pursuing collaborative research projects with Americanists in another country. Again, clearinghouse participants could establish contact among themselves.

c) Book/Journals/Material Exchanges: The clearinghouse would gather and publish information on the books, journals, and journal subscriptions that individuals or institutions have to offer and wish to receive. It could also include information on needs and offerings of other materials such as course syllabi, microfilm, videos, equipment, and basic supplies.

2) Lobbying Activities

Another common vision of respondents is that the OAH should continue and/or initiate lobbying and advocacy activities on issues related to international resource exchanges. Specific aspects of OAH lobbying activities are outlined below:

a) Advocating Scholar Exchanges: Lobby for further U.S. support of international exchanges and funding for both Americans to travel abroad and foreign Americanists to travel to the U.S. This might involve lobbying for an expansion and/or redesign of the Fulbright program or another USIA sponsored program.

b) Seeking Government Support for Regional Symposia: Advocate that the USIA allocate funds for the support of regional mini-conferences on U.S. history to be held abroad. As needed, this might involve lobbying/testimony on behalf of USIA budget proposals.

c) Pursuing Government Funding for Foreign Libraries: Continue lobbying activities to secure federal designation of selected foreign libraries as repositories of U.S. materials and for U.S. purchase of books for designated libraries.

3) OAH Coordinated or Created Programs

A number of suggested programs would be either created by or coordinated through the OAH. Information on these is summarized below:

a) Creating Scholar Exchanges: The OAH could conduct further research on extant international exchange programs, especially the European exchange pool ERASMUS. Based on such research, the Organization could either promote the adoption of U.S. institutions into the ERASMUS network or create a network of participating foreign and domestic institutions in the image of ERASMUS. In addition, the OAH could establish a fund to fully support or subsidize travel by foreign scholars to the OAH Annual Meeting.

b) Coordinating Regional Symposia/Supporting Joint Research: The OAH could coordinate and conduct regular regional symposia, seminars or mini-conferences on U.S. history around the globe, possibly with funding support from the USIA. Such programs could be tied to scholarly exchange opportunities for Americans (e.g., Americans attend and participate in conferences as part of a short stay abroad). In addition, the OAH Annual Meeting program committee could coordinate its planning activities with the program committees of foreign associations, sponsoring sessions on similar topics and establishing a mechanism for cross-reporting of findings. The OAH could also establish incentives to promote collaborative research projects among domestic and

foreign Americanists. Possible incentives would include annual prizes and publication of research.

c) Funding Material Resource Needs: The OAH could establish a fund to give or subsidize subscriptions to the Journal of American History to foreign institutions. A similar funding mechanism could be established to subsidize the purchase of books or supplies for foreign scholars. In addition, the OAH could undertake a project to produce and distribute videotapes of lectures in American history.

Survey respondents obviously had little trouble imagining new and better models for international engagement. One final, but truly essential, finding of the survey speaks to all of the opportunities outlined above. The survey suggests that any OAH program to further international engagement will have to address the unique challenges faced by our colleagues in the developing nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America as well as those practicing in the states of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Our world remains one of stark contrasts between the material resources of nations, and these differences in the relative material wealth of nations pose challenges to international exchanges. So, for instance, while respondents in Europe and the Pacific Rim report that funding for travel to the United States is difficult to obtain, our broader experience informs us that scholars in developing countries face even greater difficulty in obtaining travel grants. Their difficulties in this area are further exacerbated by the generally much higher cost of air transportation between the United States and the cities of Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the great disparity that exists between the currency values of developing countries and the United States. If the fruit of our efforts is to be a truly global community of scholars, this issue will need to be addressed in a direct fashion.

Prospects for Further Engagement:

A Report of Results of the
OAH Survey on International Resource Exchanges

A Report to the ad hoc Committee
on International Initiatives

April 1993

At its October 1992 meeting, the Executive Board of the Organization of American Historians (OAH) authorized funding for a two-level survey of 1,000 international and domestic Americanists to determine the interest in and prospects for international exchanges of people, ideas and materials. The survey was conducted under the auspices of the ad hoc Committee on International Initiatives and mailed in January 1993 to scholars, institutions, and OAH members worldwide. (For information on survey methodology, see Appendix A). The primary purpose of this survey was to provide data and ideas for the committee's use in evaluating possible OAH international initiatives. To that end, the survey was constructed to address a wide range of issues. In addition to soliciting information on those resources that Americanists worldwide either wish to receive or have to offer, the survey also sought information on existing structures for resource exchanges and on the roles that foreign governments and the U.S. government play in supporting Americanists' scholarship abroad.

I. The Purpose and Promise of International Engagement

Americanists who responded to the survey almost uniformly expressed interest--either individual or institutional--in one or more of the possible avenues of international exchange, but there was a dramatic difference between the attraction of such exchanges for American and foreign scholars.

Foreign respondents view exchanges primarily as an opportunity to obtain access to resources that can enhance their research, their teaching, and their institution's or program's curriculum. They speak of participating in resource exchanges primarily as a means to increase their sophistication or scholarship. So, for instance, an Americanist in France wants to "stay informed on recent trends in American history," while a Japanese counterpart anticipates opportunities for research trips to the U.S. for research. A Pakistani scholar complains of working in an environment "very deficient in research materials," and a Swiss scholar notes that such exchanges will permit him and his students to conduct "more advanced research projects." A German scholar sees "access to specialists" as the primary purpose of resource exchanges, and an English Americanist embraces the promise of access to "primary sources for research purposes." Running through these voices is the common goal of

gaining access to resources that will allow a tighter, more focused and more specialized scholarship.

With at least equal frequency, foreign Americanists suggest that the overall purpose of resource exchanges among Americanists would be to improve the teaching resources available to their students through exchanges. Some imagine improvement through the visits of American scholars. "We have only a small staff in the American studies Department," writes one Dutch scholar. "A visiting scholar is always important." A similar hope from Japan is to "expose students to lectures/seminars of a well known specialist" in order to "stimulate interest of Japanese students" in American history. Other respondents suggest that benefits to students may accrue indirectly through scholars' increased access to resources. Another Japanese historian seeks "to obtain syllabi to improve teaching," while an English scholar notes her goal as "catching up with scholarship/ideas for teaching purposes." A great number of their responses relate directly to the twin standards of professionalism that shape academic life worldwide: independent scholarship and teaching.

But while the foreign responses can be characterized as primarily expressing a desire for greater access to resources for specialization, a number of foreign Americanists also express a desire to participate in intercultural dialogues on the larger purposes of history. For instance, a South African scholar wishes to participate in exchanges in our to expand "our knowledge on the working of democracy." An Albanian scholar also hopes exchange with the U.S. can furnish materials for the political rehabilitation of her country. Another South African scholar sees the fruits of exchanges as including "greater familiarization between those with similar circumstances, e.g., persons from Natal with Southerners." Others simply express a desire for intercultural dialogues, such as the Scottish Americanist who seeks "fresh faces, new ideas and stimulating exchanges for staff and students." Similarly, a Ukrainian scholar envisions "cultural dialogue" as a central purpose of international engagement, a New Zealand scholar wants to "eliminate isolation," a Japanese scholar seeks "new perspectives," and a Mexican scholar seeks "communication and interchange of ideas."

Americans want broader perspectives and fresh insights. A professor of American studies identifies the "mutual clarification of cultural premises" as the purpose for international initiatives. Another respondent would participate in resource exchanges in order to achieve "cross-fertilization of ideas." Still another believes that international exchanges will give him a "better grasp on the right questions to ask" in his own work.

The theme that unites foreign and domestic responses is a

desire for access to "outside" perspectives, for experiences that can widen or reshape the framework of historical inquiry. Indeed, the term that most commonly appears in these open-ended responses is perspective. A living history museum director seeks "a broadening of perspectives on research and interpretation on rural society and material history," a state historical society director wishes to bring "diverse perspectives" to the citizens of her state, and a host of university historians want "non-US" perspectives in order to expand their own historical vision and that of their students.

But why do American scholars so passionately seek new perspectives on the practice of history? The answer appears to be two-fold. Like their foreign counterparts, domestic Americanists often express their goals in relation to their professional responsibilities as teachers. Domestic Americanists seek broader, more cosmopolitan perspectives on American history in order to expand the intellectual horizons of their students. International resource exchanges are promising to some precisely because they promise to "heighten student awareness of outside perspectives on U.S. history" and "make students aware of different cultures, values, perspectives." The second part of the answer appears related to domestic Americanists' attitudes toward their own practice of history--their topics, methods, and assumptions and their narrow conceptualizations of the practice of history itself. It is in this context, the practice of history, that scholars' calls for "greater cross-fertilization" and "mutual clarification of cultural premises" make sense. A better glimpse of the reasons that domestic Americanists desire fresh perspectives on history is provided by their answers to the survey's closing question: "What are the major problems with the practice of American history at home that you think our greater engagement with foreign Americanists will address?" If perspective is the answer, what is the problem? "Most of us are too narrow in our conception of history," writes a colleague at the National Museum of American History. "Looking at other cultures would broaden our work and give it a comparative dimension." Another scholar suggests that the placement of American history in a global context will prod American historians to "face many hidden assumptions" in their work. Other commentators concur:

> Provincialism is dismaying. Exchange, in whatever form, can improve the situation, but exchange of people has the greatest potential.

> Narrow perspectives conditioned by cultural backgrounds and expectations could be overcome somewhat by commentators from other cultures.
>
> Our technocratic, over-positivistic approach to history needs to be leavened by non-western poetics and humanistic consciousness.

Such provincialism is further exacerbated, scholars report, by the confining character of academic specialization in the United States. "Our perspectives are provincial, ingrown, overspecialized, and for all our sophistication, strangely incognizant of the place of the U.S. in world history," writes a West Coast scholar. A New York Americanist agrees, citing "parochialism and narrow professionalism" as the paramount problems with our practice of history, problems that greater engagement with foreign Americanists can address.

In these and other answers American scholars convey a sense of isolation. "Americanists are isolated by institutional and departmental affiliations," one American writes for many in reporting that history departments and universities "isolate" American scholars both from practitioners abroad and from wider audiences in this country. Forced into narrow specialized dialogues, Americanists at home complain of "insularity."

Clearly, foreign and domestic Americanists are united in desire for greater international engagement. Although they may sometimes differ in their expectations of engagement--for foreigners, greater access to specialization, and for Americans, more global perspectives--the Americanists surveyed reveal a readiness to advance and to deepen their discourse across borders.

II. Scholar Exchanges

Both foreign and domestic respondents identified exchanges of scholars -- both students and teachers -- as the single most important aspect of any international resource exchange. Approximately 85 percent of domestic respondents expressed an interest in enriching their practice of history through visits abroad and 80 percent expressed interest in receiving visiting scholars from abroad. Of the foreign respondents, 95 percent expressed an interest in visiting the United States in order to enhance their scholarship and 90 percent indicated an interest in receiving visiting Americanists as a resource for their practice of history.

While exchanges of other resources are important to Americanists, exchanges of scholars are of paramount importance. And, as shall be discussed below, they envision a host of

possible exchange arrangements to meet this need.

Travel Abroad

As united as they are in their desire to enhance their practices of history through scholar exchanges, respondents from the US and abroad seek such opportunities in order to meet very different needs. This difference is most clearly apparent in the reasons respondents gave for wishing to participate in foreign travel (either to the US or abroad). Foreign Americanists overwhelmingly identified research as the purpose of their travel to the United States; Americanists practicing in the United States, on the other hand, largely cited needs for intercultural contacts and idea exchange.

Of the foreign respondents who specifically identified the needs they would be trying to fulfill through a U.S. visit, 85 percent indicate as a central purpose the pursuit of independent research and archival work in the U.S. They seek more contact with the specialized practice of American history--firsthand access to primary sources and to the latest literature and methods. Generally, these respondents also indicate an interest in supplementing their research activities in the U.S. with either teaching and lecturing or with discussions with American historians. Approximately one-third of the respondents express an interest in teaching. While the survey does not fully reveal why they wanted to teach in the United States, some report that teaching would help them to become familiar with American students and American culture. Others view teaching activities as a means to offset the expenses of exchange.

A slightly smaller percentage expressed a desire to exchange ideas with American historians or to access scholarly debates in the U.S. Of those who identified an interest in contact with American scholars, many couched their interest in terms of specialization. For instance, a Pakistani scholar wishes to "catch up with the latest ideas in the practice of history," and hopes that other Pakistani scholars might be able to study in the US so that they "could return to setup American history programs" in Pakistan. An Americanist from the People's Republic of China would arrange a U.S. visit precisely "to meet specialists," and a French scholar seeks to "discuss recent developments in [the] historiography of U.S. foreign relations."

Domestic respondents are much less inclined to ground the purpose of their visits abroad in the pursuit of specialization. Research or access to archives is identified by a far smaller percentage of domestic respondents as a purpose of their travel abroad. More often they identify the exchange of ideas through workshops with other historians and cultural contacts as the purpose of such visits abroad. One museum scholar wishes to "compare practices" in overseas museums with those in the United

States, a New York university professor wants to "learn about historians in other countries," and a state humanities council director wants to learn "about comparable organizations" abroad.

American scholars less often express interest in activities of strict professional development--research, conference presentations, and teaching responsibilities--and reveal a desire to make connections, to enter conversations with foreign historians, to compare not just their findings and methodologies but themselves and their assumptions. In expressing these purposes for foreign travel, Americans are criticizing the practice of history at home. To escape insularity and isolation, they seek exposure to alternatives. The "value of exchange programs comes in meeting interesting scholars and in seeing how other societies arrange themselves," writes a midwestern colleague. An Americanist in museum practice wishes to view the alternatives of his colleagues abroad in order to "learn about other approaches to historical research and interpretation in museums."

Receiving Visitors from Abroad

To many foreign respondents, receiving visiting Americanists seems particularly suited to their goals of strengthening their institutional offerings in the field and increasing the sophistication and specialization of their program. When asked what they would like a visiting American historian to offer their institution, more than 95 percent of respondents suggested teaching, either through seminars, lectures, or workshops. A Netherlands program seeks American visitors for "participation in the curriculum at every level, especially the reviewing of graduate students' work," while a Ukrainian scholar wants "consultations with our students." Such visitors can both augment sometimes limited teaching expertise in certain areas of the field and update scholars and students alike on "new methodological approaches" and "current debates in US historiography." For at least some foreign scholars (perhaps those most interested in improving the teaching resources of their institutions), versatility is a key attribute for American visitors. Several would like to receive visits by "generalists" or those "capable of giving an overview of the field."

A larger number of respondents, however, specify one or more particular specialized fields from which they wish to receive visiting Americanists. Because respondents overwhelmingly identified teaching as what they sought visitors to offer, it is possible that such specialists will, again, serve to complement the course offering of specialized faculty abroad in both graduate and undergraduate instruction. But foreign scholars' interest in receiving visiting specialists also relates to their commonly expressed purpose in participating in exchanges generally: to receive the "access to specialists" that can

professionalize their work.

The answers of domestic Americanists to what type of foreign visitors they would like to have visit their institutions reflect to a large extent their preoccupation with receiving new perspectives on their history. Compared to their foreign counterparts, American scholars more often expressed interest in hosting interdisciplinary scholars, even those whose primary interests lie outside the U.S. field. One American historian notes that a scholar's "field is less important than [his/her] approaches," and that his program would wishes to host scholars with "a novel approach . . . comparative, for example." A midwestern state humanities council is interested in "humanities professionals in all humanities disciplines that could speak to issues of culture." A university scholar who has participated previously in overseas exchanges suggests that "a sociologist, political scientist, or literary critic" would be good candidates for visits to his program, adding that the "best people found working on American issues [overseas] often have a strong grounding in another discipline." Although they comprise a relatively small percentage of the responses to this question, these comments are very suggestive of the larger promise that international exchanges represent to many Americanists in practice in the U.S.: fresh perspectives. A similar thought comes from this West Coast scholar who, while preferring visits from scholars working in her same period, is mostly interested in hosting "someone with broad interests, not overly specialized."

But like their foreign counterparts, domestic respondents most often indicated a desire to receive visiting Americanists who are specialists. This desire seems to extend from their interest in expanding the comparative aspect of their practice of history, as evidence by the fact that domestic scholars are distinctly interested in hosting scholars who share the same specialization as the survey respondents. So, for instance, an historian of Mexican-American cultural interchange seeks a visiting scholar interested in Mexican culture and politics, a scholar in South Florida seeks another who shares an interest in U.S.-Cuba relations, and a rural historian seeks "someone interested in southern history or rural history." That the purpose of such exchanges is to share ideas regarding the practice of history is evident. A midwestern scholar seeks visits by scholars "doing comparable work in material culture." Such visitors from abroad who share a specialized interest with a host institution's faculty can offer focused comparative perspectives. These, in turn, provide natural avenues for entry into discussions of the larger difference in perspective occasioned by cultural expectations.

Obstacles to Exchanges of Scholars

Perhaps to no one's surprise, the survey revealed that opportunities for foreign travel for both American and non-American scholars of the U.S. are quite limited. Scholar exchanges among Americanists are more popular as an idea than they are deemed practical as an option. In order to help us better comprehend the perceived obstacles to foreign exchanges of scholars, the survey sought specific information on the resources scholars require for foreign travel, the resources currently available for foreign travel, and the strengths and weaknesses of current exchange programs.

Obstacles Confronting Foreign Scholars

Foreign scholars were asked to identify those specific resources that they might need to make possible a visit to the United States. Eighty-five percent indicated travel assistance of some sort would be required for them to travel to the U.S., 79 percent would need some remuneration, either through salary or stipend, and 79 percent indicated a need for room and board in the U.S. A slightly smaller percentage listed office space in the U.S. as a possibly necessary resource. Other needs identified included accommodations for family members/childcare, access to computer/electronic data banks, and access to good university libraries.

In part, a sense for the obstacles to greater foreign engagement among Americanists can be gained by reviewing the limitations of current exchange programs. Slightly less than half of the foreign respondents indicated that they had access to some sort of program other than the Fulbright to assist them in studying abroad. The non-Fulbright sources of travel support most commonly identified are American-based programs, such as the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Historical Association, the Ford Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the programs of the USIS, and the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX). An equal number of respondents either identified institutional/departmental exchanges between a U.S. university and their institution or informal contacts with U.S. colleagues as their non-Fulbright travel resource. The next most commonly identified resources for travel support are those in respondents' countries, such as foundations, universities, and foreign governments. Examples of such sources include the German Marshall Fund (Germany), the Ministry of Education (Italy), the Nitobe Fellowship (Japan), and the Humanities Research Centre (New Zealand). Of the respondents who identified at least one of these non-Fulbright sources of travel support, half are from Europe and twenty-five percent practice in Asian countries. Such non-Fulbright support is avaliable to only a handful of Americanists in practice in Latin America, the Middle East, or Africa.

Although respondents were also asked to assess the strengths and weakness of these various programs, no clear pattern emerged among comments on program strengths. Several who identified the ACLS program noted that its strength lies in providing foreign scholars with an opportunity to conduct independent research in the U.S. Other programs were praised for bringing American scholars to foreign institutions, for their financial support generally, or for their flexibility. Criticisms of the non-Fulbright programs center squarely on issues of funding levels and availability. "Funds arrive late and are scarce" for participants in a program partially funded by the Italian government. Both a Japanese and a British scholar find ACLS funding to be tight, the latter noting that exchange financing is "inadequate to live at a normal level in a large city." A participant in USIS programs suggests that funding may be a problem in part because the expense for relocating for a substantial period of time is excessive.

Poorly financed as these exchange options may be, competition for the few slots they offer is heavy. Because a university program in Ireland is open to all disciplines, it is "only occasionally available" to historians. There are only a very small number of grants available, reports a Japanese scholar, and "only a few scholars [are] funded for U.S. travel" by Japanese foundations. Too, the scholar who identified informal contact with colleagues in the U.S. as his source of travel support characterizes it as "haphazard and unpredictable regarding date and length."

Several respondents identify specific needs that are not being served by these exchanges. Several scholars suggest funding is needed to support foreign trips for graduate students. A Japanese scholar envisions "two week lecture courses to graduate students and young scholars," and a French Americanist seeks funding to send "a young scholar to do research for an MA."

Foreign scholars express differing expectations of the ideal length of visits to the U.S. So, for instance, an English scholar bemoans the lack of funding for short-term visits while a German Americanist criticizes the lack of year-long exchanges. Most respondents indicate that they prefer foreign exchanges that last between one and six months. But almost half of respondents did not specify a single ideal length of stay, either choosing to present a range of possible visit lengths (e.g., 1-6 months) or several different possible lengths for different purposes or seasons (e.g., 8 weeks for research and a semester for teaching; 6 weeks in summer). The responses to this question, taken together, seem to indicate that scholars have quite different availabilities for foreign travel. Apparently, there is a need for a scholar exchange program that can accommodate individuals seeking shorter visits abroad than the standard full- or academic-year exchanges and that can remain flexible regarding

the construction of exchanges. Indeed, flexibility may be the hallmark of any program structured to accommodate their needs.

Obstacles Confronting Domestic Scholars

Slightly less than half of the Americanists practicing in the United States indicated that their institutions participate in informal exchange programs with international institutions. Of these, nearly all indicated that the exchange programs involved faculty. The programs reveal a great variety of arrangements, ranging from the highly structured to the less formal, and it is difficult to generalize from the limited descriptive information on these programs. Many of the brief descriptions indicate that exchange programs are tied to one or more specific institutions, and that these are usually universities or museums in Europe. A few respondents indicated that their exchange program excludes (or largely ignores) Americanists or favors disciplines other than history. Exchange programs appear to be arranged on a university- or college-level when they also encompass student exchanges. Perhaps slightly less formal are the exchanges arranged between individual departments, and the least formal exchanges are those arranged episodically between individual scholars. Some of the arrangements described are summarized below:

> The University of Texas at Arlington has just established a Center for the Study of the Southwest in cooperation with several Mexican institutions, and faculty exchanges will be a focus of its activities.
>
> The University of Washington has exchanges with schools in Norway and Germany, but these do not usually involve historians.
>
> The University of Georgia offers faculty exchanges, but these are "mostly brief visits, and mostly in areas of sciences or agriculture."
>
> Scholars at the University of Florida engage in short-term exchanges with Cuba, but feel that "more sustained contact is needed."
>
> Faculty at Penn State avail themselves of formal and informal exchanges that support overseas teaching and research.
>
> San Diego State University's exchanges involve the "swap of faculty with each being paid by their own university."

Historic Deerfield relies on informal arrangements with individuals in Britain and Europe to effect international exchanges.

The University of Tulsa history department has "bilateral, even-up" faculty exchanges with the University of Costa Rica.

Although it was beyond the scope of this survey to flesh out the details of the various arrangements for foreign exchange at American museums and institutions, the survey did solicit comments on the ways in which these various programs fail to meet the needs of Americanists. A host of complaints arose.

The Fulbright program, respondents report, presents a number of drawbacks for Americanists. Some contend Fulbright criteria are too restricting. Museum scholars and those not involved in American studies or diplomatic history are excluded from participation. A California scholar believes that existing foreign exchange programs, including Fulbright exchanges, tend to be "registered as isolated, individual experiences." In this regard, they are out of step with the unique international exchange goals of Americanists, who seek greater group contact. At least one respondent senses that Fulbrights are "almost impossible to get unless you have connections within the country." The Fulbright exchanges were also criticized for being deficient in financial support and for excluding non-citizens. One scholar suggests that while large, Fulbright-scale program support is necessary because "one cannot afford housing [and] air fare to visit abroad," many of the usual funding agencies doubt Americanists' needs for foreign travel and research.

University-based exchanges have their limitations as well. A UCLA colleague writes that university-centered "annual exchange programs can lose their excitement," and suggests that a rotating system of exchanges among a network of universities might help alleviate this problem. Universities can get bogged down in hassles with salaries, pensions, insurance, etc., unless they structure straight faculty exchanges with "no money changing hands," suggests another Americanist. Indeed, several domestic respondents emphasize that the success of current programs stems from their emphasis on "even-up" exchanges in which both scholars retain their own salaries. Foreign scholars want a network of scholars and institutions that they can visit," writes a Purdue scholar, but university-based programs often cannot provide such extended networks. Finally, because university exchange programs are often interdisciplinary, domestic Americanists -- like their foreign counterparts -- find themselves competing in a large pool for limited opportunities.

Some Americans feel that extant exchange programs largely

exclude third world countries. A truly global exchange program, writes a North Carolina scholars, would "stop catering to North Atlantic links and finally begin to think globally, so that 'abroad' is not only a code name for Europe." Other scholars expressed concern regarding the inapplicability of some current exchange structures to students. At Goshen College there is not a need for "highly specialized research scholars" but for individuals who can serve as "resources for students." A Duke University colleague complains that American graduate students rarely have adequate funding for language study or exploration abroad "at a key time in their training." He envisions an international Americanist exchange program that "would not include anyone over 30."

One of the more consistent criticisms of domestic Americanists is that existing exchanges are too long. Clearly, a number of scholars seek shorter, more flexible exchange conditions. Many scholars "can't get away for a full semester," notes a California historian. Year- and semester-long programs are "too extensive a stay for those with children and dual career households," reports a scholar at Claremont Graduate College. On a similar note, a Texas Americanist points out that exchange programs rarely make "suitable arrangements for families." All of these scholars envision scholar exchanges that encompass shorter spans of time. Museum scholars, in particular, seem interested in "short-term travel to examine collections and practices of museums abroad."

Like their foreign counterparts, American scholars have mixed expectations regarding the ideal length for exchange visits. Responses again ranged from weeks to years. But respondents in the U.S. generally prefer exchanges of a semester or less, and domestic Americanists seek even shorter visits abroad than their foreign colleagues. More than half of those surveyed would be interested in visits abroad of between one and six weeks.

A quarter of the respondents to this question did not specify a single ideal length of stay, either choosing to present a range of possible lengths (e.g., one to six months) or several different possible lengths suited to different purposes or seasons (e.g., three to twelve months; one month for summer/sabbatical). The responses to this question generally seem to parallel the responses of foreign Americanists. They indicate a need for a scholar exchange program that can accommodate individuals seeking shorter visits abroad than the standard full- or academic-year exchanges and that can offer a variety of exchange models to meet a variety of purposes, such as research, conference attendance, or networking with other scholars.

Foreign and domestic Americanists are inhibited from greater

international engagement by a variety of factors. The most prominent obstacles that foreign and domestic scholars identify are:

1) The high cost of exchanges (travel, living expenses) and the limited number of exchange funding sources; and
2) The inflexibility of current exchange programs, especially with regard to the length of exchanges.

Clearly, the need for financial support is far greater for scholars practicing in developing nations as opposed to those practicing at relatively well-heeled Western European or Asian universities. Both foreign and domestic scholars feel that existing structures for international exchange are too few and that those that do exist (e.g., Fulbright) insufficiently fulfill their needs and are poorly structured to accommodate Americanists' unique purposes for international exchange.

Imagined Alternatives

Suspecting that Americanists worldwide were experiencing problems with existing mechanisms for international exchanges, we asked respondents to "imagine" an exchange program that would more closely meet their needs and purposes. While some of the responses to this question were focused on mechanisms for exchanges of materials or ideas, the vast majority specifically centered on exchanges of scholars. The question invited creative responses, and that's what we got.

Several respondents suggested simple, individual-to-individual exchanges based on principles of reciprocity. An Italian scholar suggests a simple exchange of offices and courses between faculty members, each scholar keeping his or her salary. A Scottish scholar is open to "exchanges of homes for summer to allow me access to library resources." Such exchanges are quite popularly received by Americans, 58 percent of whom indicate interest in making even exchanges of homes and/or cars with foreign Americanists. Any exchange would do well, a New York scholar suggests, to emphasize "ties between individuals rather than institutions." An American suggests that a program based on shared principles of reciprocity would widely expand the opportunities of scholars (and others) to visit countries abroad for teaching, research or simply travel. A Zambian Americanist envisions a program that will allow "historians to visit for a month and then Zambian historians to visit the U.S. for the same duration." Two American scholars suggest pairing Americanists from the U.S. and abroad for "partner teaching" and research stints, "the two working for some period at one and then the other institution."

Individual scholars from Florida, New Zealand, North Carolina, Italy, South Africa, and elsewhere all envisioned programs that would specifically support the exchange of graduate

and/or undergraduate students of American history. One scholar sketched a program that would be "a truly global effort to give potential teachers and researchers of the 21st century the exposure and experiences they will need to be effective."

Several domestic Americanists suggest the development of a series of short, intensive programs or conferences around which funded scholar or student exchanges could be arranged. A museum professional envisions such "short-term and intensive" programs being constructed in order to "push understanding [of] the people and their culture as much as the exchange of scholarship." Another Americanist working in a museum setting suggests a program in which "museum curators and other professional staff would travel to this country or abroad and spend a few days touring three or four museums and visiting with staff." Similarly, a student exchange might be planned around mini-seminars, suggests a Florida Americanist.

Both foreign and domestic scholars recommend establishing networks of scholars for inter-university exchanges. An Italian respondent points to a program modeled after the European ERASMUS network, with a central agency coordinating the exchanges of students and faculty among participating institutions. Perhaps Americanists could tap into ERASMUS or another existing interdisciplinary exchange network, or create their own program in its image. Another scholar suggests the establishment of "a pool, like student exchange pools, in which the OAH would act as a clearinghouse." A similar idea for a clearinghouse in which scholars can register their interests and needs is advanced by a Japanese Americanist. Whatever the model, others suggests, it ought to be "well-resourced" and able to keep costs relatively low for all participants.

Scholars want exchange programs to be "flexible to meet the particular needs of the parties involved and of the department," writes a West Coast scholar. A Mexican scholar seeks a program in which "each institution must propose and ask for what it needs." Her institution is working in the area of American foreign policy, but almost all the exchange invitations they receive are for the study of American women or literature. A New Zealand colleague echoed this concern for programs flexible enough to be "adapted to institutional needs." Such desire for flexibility was also evident in the vision of a scholar who seeks a program "run by the OAH and cooperating institutions with many options." At least two respondents believe any exchange program should to address the issue of language training.

These imagined alternatives of survey respondents produced a wide range of proposed exchange models, from formally structured, seminar/conference-centered exchanges to less formal, person-to-person reciprocal connections, from an OAH-led international network of Americanists interested in exchanges to linkages with

extant exchange networks, from student-centered exchanges to scholar-centered exchanges. On the whole, however, respondents emphasized the importance of establishing links directly between individual scholars, or at least between individual institutions.

This suggests that true exchanges of resources among individual foreign and domestic Americanists (or their institutions) might best serve as the basis for a new model of international engagement. To probe this possibility, the survey attempted to identify those resources that domestic and foreign Americanists and their institutions might be willing to offer in exchange for resources received from abroad. Although most respondents could not make commitments on behalf of their institutions, they did indicate the types of resources that they or their institutions could make available to visiting scholars. Inasmuch as scholars were able to identify a host of possible variables for quid pro quo exchanges, the answers are interesting and suggest the viability of a person-to-person exchange clearinghouse. Consider the following:

> One in three Americans believe that salary/stipend arrangements could be made to support a visiting foreign scholar, and one in five of foreign scholars imagine that similar arrangements could be made in their countries for an American.
>
> Thirty-six percent of foreign respondents believe their institutions would be able to offer room/board to a visiting American scholar; twenty-eight percent of Americans think similar arrangements could be made for foreign scholars in the U.S.
>
> Approximately two-thirds of domestic respondents believe that office space and telephones could be supplied to visiting scholars. Slightly higher percentages of foreign Americanist can offer the same accommodations to American visitors.

And both foreign and domestic respondents indicated that their institutions could offer access to a variety of resources for scholarship, including libraries, cultural officials, and grassroots organizations. All of this suggests that scholar exchanges have the potential to be constructed as "even-up" exchanges based on principles of reciprocity.

Further evidence that scholars are open to exchanges constructed on the basis of reciprocity comes from information respondents provided on the resources that they would be willing to offer host institutions. Both domestic and foreign respondents indicated a ready willingness to offer their energies

and expertise as well as material resources to institutions that hosted them. While it is uncertain if such resources would be offered in exchange for hosting itself (e.g., I will teach in exchange for room and board) or as part of a scholar-for-scholar exchange (e.g., both scholars will teach as part of exchange relationship), respondents' answers indicate a general openness to invention of alternative exchange models. For instance, more than four-fifths of both foreign and domestic respondents would be willing to offer history workshops, lectures, or teaching and lecturing to a hosting institution. Almost 30 percent of Americans and 38 percent of foreign scholars would offer journals, periodicals and/or books to a hosting institution or host. Perhaps most importantly, 56 percent of foreign and 49 percent of American respondents believe that they can offer reciprocal hosting arrangement in their own country in exchange for those received.

Although only tentative conclusions should be drawn from this data, it does suggest that an international exchange program based on principles of reciprocity would be both feasible and well received. But while foreign and domestic Americanists demonstrate both a willingness and capacity to offer valuable resources to one another as part of international scholar exchanges, it is clear that one fundamental gap remains in the picture: funding or subsidies for international travel. The establishment of a clearinghouse of international scholar exchange opportunities might indeed help scholars make valuable connections for possible reciprocal hosting arrangements, but the utility of such a clearinghouse would be sharply limited if minimal sources of outside travel funds were not also secured. And such funding mechanisms would especially need to accommodate scholars from third world countries, whose travel costs to the United States are frequently very high and whose salaries are insufficient to support them for a U.S. visit.

III. Exchanges of Ideas

The survey reveals that American historians worldwide share a desire for a richer intellectual engagement with their colleagues. And while the creation of face-to-face encounters among scholars through scholar exchanges may be the single most popular exchange initiative for facilitating the exchange of ideas, survey respondents also suggested other possible initiatives to advance conversations across borders.

Conferences

Some scholars view conference participation as a key element in the exchange of ideas and perspectives on history, and respondents offered a host of ideas for making conference participation more accessible to all. There is, first and foremost, a strong desire to have foreign Americanists

participate in the annual meeting of the OAH. Scholars from Mexico, England, the People's Republic of China, Australia, and other countries expressed this desire as did their colleagues in the United States. The OAH should establish programs to "enable attendance and paper-giving at various American historical conferences," proposed one foreign respondent. In order to facilitate idea exchange, writes a California Americanist, the OAH should sponsor "annual miniconferences (maybe at the time and place of the OAH annual meeting) on a specific different topic, involving groups of both U.S. and foreign scholars." An Ohio scholar agrees, noting that the OAH should ensure both that there are lots of visitors from abroad at its meetings and that these foreign visitors are "integrated into the OAH program and not just in separate sessions."

Perhaps because they recognize funding to be the principal obstacle to wider international attendance of OAH meetings, many foreign respondents identified conference travel grants as one of the manners in which the U.S. government and/or the OAH could assist them in their study of the U.S. According to a Polish scholar, "travel grants to help participation in U.S. conferences will be [the] most important" assistance the U.S. government gives to foreign scholars. Several domestic scholars hope that the OAH itself might make possible funding for foreign scholar attendance at U.S. conferences, either through travel grants or subsidies. These might best be given to university scholars from "poorer countries" and/or those who will be presenting papers at conferences. Yet another alternative suggested by an overseas colleague: "Hold the OAH meeting abroad on occasion."

An obvious alternative to bringing all interested Americanists to the United States annually for the OAH annual meeting or other academic meetings is to hold regional conferences on U.S. history abroad. The idea of holding regional conferences or symposia on American history has a number of proponents both here and abroad. For several years the Japanese community of Americanists sponsored an American studies symposium for Americanists from Asian countries, and such regional symposia, one Japanese scholar suggests, should be established by the OAH. "Sponsor some kind of conference in Havana," suggests one American scholar, recognizing the travel limitations experienced by even our closest academic neighbors. A Pakistani scholar also envisions "regional conferences on American history," conferences that will be more accessible to distant foreign scholars such as himself. So do his peers in New Zealand, the People's Republic of China and elsewhere. Arranging conferences around the globe might be the goal of an "Organization of International Congresses of Americanists," suggests a Ukrainian historian.

Such regional conferences, perhaps rotating among continents, would provide excellent opportunities for domestic

Americanists to gain fresh perspectives through brief but productive sojourns abroad. Many American scholars, as noted above in Section III, believe that scholar/student exchanges should be developed around this sort of short, intensive programs or conferences. A Minnesota scholar specifically suggests that funding be created to assist Americans who wish to travel to conferences abroad, while from Japan comes a call for just such visits: "The Japanese Association for American Studies sends members to the OAH convention each year . . . . We want you to send U.S. historians to JAAS conferences." Similarly, a Mexican scholar wants the OAH to support American scholars who wish to attend conferences in Mexico. Finally, if regional conferences themselves are cost-prohibitive, a West Coast scholar suggests, then the OAH should "set up teleconferencing by computer network with foreign scholars."

Collaborative Research

Another means by which Americanists might facilitate international exchanges of ideas is through collaborative research projects. These projects, whether bilateral or multilateral, might be constructed in a number of different ways.

From both foreign and domestic respondents came responses indicating an interest in collaborative scholarship by teams of Americanists practicing in different countries. An Indiana scholar, for instance, envisions collaborative projects matching one American and one foreign scholar who would work in first one and then the other country. Similarly, a scholar from the Netherlands hopes to create initiatives in which "a team of a Dutch university and of an American university decide to work together on a topic of American history," such as the "Transatlantic movement of Ideas." The OAH could "foster the cooperation between transatlantic teams," he continues, either through funding, publicity, or by facilitating the publication of study results. Scholars from Poland, Zambia, France, and other foreign countries also envision joint research programs between Americanists in the U.S. and abroad. Scholars from the People's Republic of China suggest the need for cooperation in research and "coordination" between U.S. and foreign scholars generally.

The most common collaborative arrangement might involve scholars interested in joint comparative research on a particular topic. Whether comparing visions of asylum in the United States and Switzerland, the "handling of indigenous peoples" in the United States and South Africa, or the treatment of political dissidents in America and Eastern Europe, such projects would match scholars in different countries who have access to different primary materials and resources. Collaborative projects with a comparative emphasis seem particularly attractive to domestic respondents, who are interested (as discussed in section I) in gaining perspective through the comparison of

findings, methodologies, and assumptions with their foreign counterparts. A New York scholar interested in political history hopes to exchange ideas through "international research collaboration." Similarly, a Washington scholar believes that "faculty cooperative projects" will be the most important fruit of international exchanges.

Yet another alternative might be that scholars with entirely different interests would exchange research services with one another in their respective countries. So for instance, a Maryland scholar is willing to say to a foreign colleague, "I'll research for you if you'll research for me." Whatever the model of collaborative research, connections could be facilitated through the OAH suggests a Colorado scholar. She proposes that the OAH "publish research 'posters' from members here and abroad so we're more aware of each others' interests and goals."

The survey suggests that the possibilities for idea exchange through collaborative research would be greatly enhanced were such joint projects coordinated with opportunities for scholar exchanges. Perhaps projects could be tied to seminars at regional meetings or the programs associational annual meetings. Collaborative research projects between universities might provide an especially good way to introduce graduate students to scholarship practices abroad. Such projects might naturally evolve from session themes at annual or regional conferences, or groups of universities might together form thematic networks along structured along research interests (e.g., exceptionalism, patriotism, etc.).

Of course, international idea exchanges readily occur among those scholars who have access to the books, journals, exhibition catalogs, periodicals, documentaries, and other products created by their peers who practice in other countries. So, respondents suggest, any effort to further the exchange of ideas generally must seek to enhance the dissemination of research of American historians around the globe. The possibilities for enhanced material resource exchanges are discussed in the following section.

IV. Exchanges of Materials

The survey revealed that Americanists at home and abroad experience needs for a wide range of materials, from scholarly materials to basic supplies, and that they envision a variety of models to accomplish greater exchanges of such materials. As might be expected, historians practicing in the United States express fewer needs than their foreign peers for access to scholarly resources, and almost no need for the more fundamental building blocks of scholarly practice (e.g., maps, computer software, typewriter parts, etc.) Foreign Americanists, on the other hand, more consistently expressed needs for both scholarly

and basic material resources.

Material Resources Needed

The survey confirmed anecdotal reports from some fellow Americanists abroad that their work in history is hindered by deficiencies in the most basic supplies. Not surprisingly, such reports primarily come from scholars in developing countries and countries, such as those in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, that are emerging from social and political turmoil. Approximately one-third of all foreign Americanists responded that they needed "basic supplies/materials" in order to assist them in their practice of history. Examples range from typewriter ribbons and cartridges to software and micro-computer diskettes, from xerox machines, videocassette players, and computers, to maps and microfilm readers. The survey did not ask for detailed information on the types of basic supplies needed by foreign scholars, and some respondents may have been hesitant to relate the material limitations under which they practice. But others, such as one Russian scholar, were candid about the problems of practicing history in a world of very limited supplies and resources. "I need a typewriter with Latin letters to type material on American history," he writes. "I cannot afford to buy this on salary of $16 per month."

Both Americanists abroad and at home expressed the need for greater access to primary source materials (print and microfilm) for research purposes. Approximately 75 percent of foreign scholars would like to have access to microfilm or print research materials from the United States. A smaller but still significant percentage of American scholars (40 percent) similarly seek access to print or microfilm resources from abroad, whether related to U.S. history (e.g., emigration) or other topics.

Most foreign Americanists report a need for wider access to journals and periodicals from the United States (70 percent), and a fair number of their American counterparts (55 percent) seek to receive similar scholarly publications from abroad. In addition, the survey revealed that a great many foreign Americanists seek to expand the book collections of their university libraries. According to a New Zealand scholar, the cost of American textbooks in her country is prohibitive. A British scholar cites a lack of "monographs and specialist studies" in her university's library collection. One scholar in Mexico hopes to build a collection of books in Spanish about the United States, while another Mexican colleague studying American political reports that her scholarship is hindered by her program's lack of "a library of American classical political thought."

What would be the best way to meet these material resource needs of American scholars at home and abroad? For some, the

scope of the problem seems to suggest the need for substantial financial resources and/or the commitment of government or foundation support. Others suggest that decentralized interpersonal or inter-institutional models of exchange seem most appropriate. Still others point to a hybrid of these models, a clearinghouse of exchange opportunities. All of these options are explored below.

Possible Models for Material Exchanges

A large number of foreign respondents suggest that deficits in scholarly materials might best be met by designation of certain libraries or research centers as repositories for materials on American history. A Scottish scholar would like the U.S. government to "make our library a centre for official U.S. government documents, census data and the Congressional Record." A scholar in England notes that the Canadian government has already made her university's library a Canadian repository and suggests that the U.S. government follow suit. Other scholars call for a rededication to maintaining and improving the designated library collections that exist. A Louisiana scholar encourages the OAH to make sure that the universities designated for U.S. study in each country overseas have adequate library resources to keep students up to date. The U.S. government ought to "feed the needs of books in American history for the research centers, as was the case years ago," writes a French Americanist. Similarly, an Italian scholar calls for "a renewed effort to establish and run (or sponsor and fund) American libraries abroad." A Japanese student of American history suggests that the U.S. government focus on "expanding libraries, especially [collections of] microfilm and periodicals."

Many domestic Americanists see book and journal distribution as a proper function of the OAH. The Organization should continue to "donate the Journal of American History to Third World libraries (or history departments)," writes an Ohio scholar, echoing the call of many of his colleagues. The OAH should "supply books and curriculum materials" abroad suggests a District of Columbia museum scholar. A less expensive alternative for the OAH would be to act as a clearinghouse for such resource distributions. A New York scholar suggests that the OAH collect books and sets of journals for shipment to the areas of Eastern and Central Europe, China, and Latin America. Scholars could bequest book and/or journal collections to such a program, she notes, and the program could also solicit money to support journal subscriptions for scholars in developing nations. A California historian suggests that the OAH maintain an exchange database that would include information on "foreigners needs for runs of particular journals." A New Zealand Americanist envisions a program in which Americans can "send unneeded books, maps, texts" to scholars practicing abroad. Were the OAH or another organization to perform such a clearinghouse role, survey

respondents suggest, individual scholars around the world might be able to establish individual contacts as the basis for exchange.

Yet another means through which international resource sharing could be encouraged involves the establishment of OAH regional centers around the world. For instance, an Albanian academic suggests that the OAH "create a center of OAH in Albania." And a California historian suggests that the OAH should "establish a branch office in Europe." A broader articulation of this same goal comes from a Ukrainian Americanist, who envisions the "creation of an international research center under the aegis of the OAH, [with] branches in . . . . Americas, Europe, Africa and Australia." Such centers might house collections of books, journals, and research materials, provide information on exchange opportunities in the U.S., and coordinate regional conferences/workshops on American history abroad.

A final manner in which governments or international structures might directly play a role could be through a "more comprehensive/faster interlibrary loan" service, writes an Italian Americanist. He also suggests linking foreign scholars to the Library of Congress electronic catalog. A German scholar also calls for "a reliable, fast interlibrary loan system between the United States, Canada, and other countries." Under the existing program, he writes, scholars receive one out of eight of their requests after a six-month wait. He also wishes to have a "copying service for rare articles" extended to foreign Americanists.

Resources Offered: The Role of Individuals and Institutions

Other scholars suggest that individual and/or institutional material resource needs might best be accommodated on a smaller, more personal scale through one-on-one exchanges with other individuals or institutions. They suggest that other, less bureaucratic avenues, such as direct links between Americanists, might best meet such needs. For instance, in addition to teaching or lecturing at host institutions abroad, Americanists appear willing to also offer some material resources to host institutions.

For instance, approximately one in five responding Americans indicate that they or their institutions might be able to provide basic materials/supplies to foreign scholars as elements of an international exchange. One American noted that she had, during a previous exchange abroad, provided materials and book reprints to foreign scholars. Significant percentages of both foreign and domestic Americanists are willing to meet their colleagues' needs for journals, periodicals, or books as part of international exchanges, 38 percent and 29 percent respectively. A Los Angeles

scholar reports that the American field in her history department could "organize to extra books/journals to a foreign institution." An Oklahoma history department also "has books to exchange," and scholars at the Smithsonian report that they are currently exchanging books with colleagues overseas. As noted above, a number of scholars at home and abroad believe that increased sharing of books and journals among Americanists worldwide can be achieved through creation and maintenance of a database of exchange needs and opportunities.

An even larger percentage of domestic respondents will offer course syllabi, videos, or other curriculum materials (57 percent) as elements of an exchange for hosting arrangements abroad. A California scholar is ready to share her "lesson plans for Chicana history." Although unsure what her institution could offer, a Massachusetts historian would readily exchange her own syllabi and research materials with a foreign Americanist. In addition, 17 percent of Americans would be willing to provide print and microfilm source materials to colleagues at a hosting institution abroad. A slightly larger percentage of foreign Americanists (23 percent) could offer microfilm and print resources from their country if hosted in the United States.

Taken together, this data on material resource needs and potential resource exchanges suggests that Americanists hold important resources for one another and that the orchestration of matches between their various needs and offerings would enhance the scholarship of American history students worldwide.

APPENDIX A

Survey Methodology

In order to gather the most pertinent information from both Americanists practicing in the United States and those practicing abroad, two parallel but distinct surveys were designed (Appendices B and C). In general, both surveys solicited information regarding the resources needed by and resources available for American historians at the myriad points on the globe where American history is practiced. For instance, the two surveys contained parallel questions regarding motivations for exchange participation, resources that could be offered to visiting faculty members, ideal lengths of stay for foreign exchanges, and the possible roles of the OAH in promoting international engagement. At the same time, the surveys accommodated important differences between the practice of American history in the United States and abroad by including questions uniquely geared for domestic and foreign practitioners. Foreign surveys included, for example, questions regarding the availability and usefulness of the programs of the United States Information Agency as well as a question regarding structural impediments to the study of U.S. history in their country. The domestic version of the survey contained a question regarding the problems with the practice of American history at home that international exchanges could address.

The survey questions were drafted, reviewed, and refined by members of the ad hoc Committee on International Initiatives and staff members of the OAH. A primary vision of the survey was to capture the voices of respondents, to allow them the opportunity and space to express their individual visions of international exchange, to tell in their own words what they need and what they have to offer. For this reason, many of the survey questions were constructed broadly and with open-ended responses. Several respondents felt compelled to attach a letter to the completed survey. While this great amount of "text" generated by our survey respondents made analysis of the survey somewhat more cumbersome (and its results hard to compare or quantify), it also lent some invaluably tangible voices to the results.

Domestic surveys were mailed to Americanists who practice in archives, museums, libraries, state historical societies, state humanities councils, as well as those in colleges and universities. The names of additional individuals were gleaned from the foreign language reviewer files and the international files at the Journal of American History. Foreign surveys were mailed to Americanists abroad who practice in museums, research centers, and historical associations as well as colleges and universities. The names of most individuals and institutions were obtained from the international files at the Journal of American History.

In addition to those mailed in January, approximately thirty

additional foreign surveys were mailed in February to individuals whose names were suggested by our initial survey respondents. In an effort to increase the response rate from Africa, a follow-up mailing was sent in February encouraging respondents to bypass the slow and costly postal routes by returning surveys through either FAX, e-mail or their country's USIS post.

Of the 512 domestic surveys mailed, 13 were returned unanswered (address changes, deceased, etc.). Several respondents substituted letters for the survey. These responses were figured into the response rate. As of April 5, 76 domestic surveys had been returned, yielding a response rate of 15 percent. See Appendix D for a list of the institutional affiliations of domestic respondents.

Of the 536 foreign surveys mailed, 4 were returned unanswered (address change, deceased, etc.) Several respondents returned surveys partially completed or substituted letters for the survey. These responses were figured into the response rate. As of April 5, 74 foreign surveys had been returned, yielding a response rate of 14 percent. See Appendix E for information on responses by country.

Domestic and foreign surveys continue to be returned.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS
Committee on International Initiatives Questionnaire

As part of an effort to promote further engagement among Americanists worldwide, the Committee on International Initiatives wants to identify those resources from the United States and abroad that members would like to receive to assist them in their practice of American history. Using reciprocity as the basis for an international exchange initiative, the following questionnaire seeks to discover what participants in an international exchange would need and what they would have to offer. We also wish to determine what programs currently foster exchanges as well as what other kinds of efforts already are being made to deliver American history abroad and international perspectives on the American past here at home.

If necessary, please continue your responses on a separate sheet.

Name _____

Institution _____

_____

Address _____

_____

_____

_____

Fax _____

ques.dom

Part I: Needs/Wants

1. What resources from abroad would you like to have access to or receive in order to assist you in the practice of history? (Please check those that apply and indicate any other resources in the form of people or ideas or materials that would assist you.)

___ visiting scholars (for teaching/workshops)
___ opportunities to visit abroad
___ understanding of other countries' practices of history
___ microfilm or print research materials
___ periodical/journals/dissertations

Other _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What needs would you be trying to fulfill in working out exchanges of people, ideas, and/or materials? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. In particular, what individuals, institutions or countries might you be interested in exchanging resources with? _____

_____

_____

_____

4. If the exchange involved people, what type of Americanist would you like to visit your institution? _____

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

. Would you be interested in going abroad for such exchanges?
Yes ____ No ____

. For what purposes?_____

. What would be an ideal length of time for a visit?_____

. Would an international directory of Americanists be helpful
o you?_____

art II: Offerings

. In exchange for resources received from abroad, what could
ou (or your institution) offer in terms of people or ideas or
aterials?_____

. If hosting a foreign Americanist, what would your
stitution be willing to offer? (Please check those that
ply.)

__ salary/stipend
__ room and board
__ travel
__ car
__ library or other professional privileges
__ photocopying
____ translators
____ office space
____ telephone
____ computer

her_____

11. If hosted by an institution abroad, what would you be willing to offer that institution in exchange? (Please check those that apply.)

____ history workshops/seminars
____ teaching or lecturing
____ microfilm or print sources from the U.S.
____ journals/periodicals/books
____ basic materials/supplies
____ course syllabi, supplemental readings, videos or other curriculum material
____ reciprocal hosting arrangement at your home institution

Other_____

12. Would you or others you know be interested in an even exchange of homes and cars? Yes ____ No ____

13. Is there a particular type of exchange relationship that you would like to establish? (e.g., exchange of scholars, journals, museum practice information, etc.)_____

14. What would it take (institutional resources, structures, mechanisms, etc.) to implement such exchanges of people and materials?_____

Part III: Existing Programs

15. Does your institution currently have more informal exchange programs with international institutions? Yes _____ No _____ Please describe and indicate how and why they succeed and how they could be improved._____

16. What needs if any do you have that are not being met by existing exchange programs (Fulbright, for instance)?_____

17. Imagine a different kind of exchange program for people, ideas and resources: What would it look like?_____

Part IV: OAH as Clearinghouse

18. What would be the most important elements of an American history clearinghouse that would try to connect people and institutions interested in resource exchanges? (The following list is far from comprehensive. Please check those that apply and add any others that you wish.)

____ database of current needs and/or possible exchanges
____ regular publication of exchange opportunities
____ electronic mail bulletin board
____ research queries

Other _____

19. What else could the OAH do to foster scholarship on America history abroad?_____

20. What are the major problems with the practice of American history at home that you think our greater engagement with foreign Americanists will address? _____

Please return this questionnaire to:

Patrick Ettinger
OAH
112 N. Bryan Street
Bloomington, IN 47408
FAX: 812-855-0696

Please list the names of other individuals who should receive this questionnaire._____

A similar questionnaire is being sent to foreign Americanists. Do you have the names of individuals to whom we should send it?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS
Committee on International Initiatives Questionnaire

As part of an effort to promote further engagement among Americanists worldwide, the Committee on International Initiatives wants to identify those resources from the United States and abroad that members would like to receive to assist them in their practice of "American history," broadly conceived. Using reciprocity as the basis for an international exchange initiative, the following questionnaire seeks to discover what participants in an international resource exchange program would need and what they would have to offer. We also wish to determine what programs currently foster exchanges as well as what other kinds of efforts already are being made to deliver American history abroad and international perspectives on the American past to the U.S.

If necessary, please continue your responses on a separate sheet.

Name _____

Institution _____

Address _____

_____

_____

_____

Fax _____

ques.int

Part I: Needs/Wants

1. What resources from the United States would you like to have access to or receive in order to assist you in the practice of history? (Please check those that apply and indicate any other resources in the form of people or ideas or materials that would assist you.)

____ visiting scholars (for teaching/workshops)
____ opportunities to travel to the United States
____ understanding of the practice of history in the U.S.
____ microfilm or print research materials
____ course syllabi, supplemental readings, videos or other curriculum materials
____ information about the practice of history
____ textbooks
____ periodicals/journals/dissertations
____ basic materials/supplies

Other _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What needs would you be trying to fulfill in working out exchanges of people, ideas or materials? _____

_____

_____

_____

3. If the exchange involved people, what type of American historian would you like to visit your institution? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

. What would you like a visiting American historian to offer our institution?_____

. What kinds of resources involving other Americanists would be ost useful for your students and yourself? (Please check those iat apply.)

__ visiting scholars for summer institutes/workshops
__ videos of American graduate classes
__ video-taped lectures by American historians
__ internships
__ curriculum development specialists

:her_____

To meet what needs and under what circumstances would you be terested in coming to the U.S.?_____

What would be an ideal length of time for a visit?_____

What specific resources might you need to make possible a sit to the United States?

__ salary/stipend ___ translators
__ room and board ___ office space
__ travel assistance

her_____

9. Would an international directory of Americanists be helpful to you?_____

10. What other needs do you have that the OAH should know about?

Part II: Offerings

11. Because we believe exchanges should be grounded in reciprocity, what types of resources would you have to offer in exchange for resources received from abroad? _____

12. What could you or your institution offer a visiting Americanist? (Please check those that apply.)

___ salary/stipend ___ translators
___ room and board ___ office space
___ travel ___ telephone
___ access to governmental, cultural, or public officials
___ access to grassroots organizations
___ microfilmed copies of primary sources

Other_____

13. If hosted by an institution in the U.S., what would you be willing to offer that institution in exchange? (Please check all that apply.)

___ history workshops/seminars
___ teaching or lecturing
___ microfilm or print resources from your country

____ journals/periodicals/books
____ reciprocal hosting arrangement in your country
Other _____

14. Is there a particular type of exchange relationship that you would like to establish? (E.g., exchange of scholars, journals, museum practice information, etc.)_____

15. What would it take (institutional resources, structures, mechanisms, etc.) to implement such exchanges of people, ideas and materials?_____

16. Are there corporations, institutions, or agencies in your country that might be willing to aid resource exchanges?_____

Part III: Existing Programs

17. Are there available to you programs other than the Fulbright for exchanging Americanists or for studying U.S. history abroad?
Yes ____ No ____ Please identify and describe _____

18. What are these programs' strengths?_____

19. Weaknesses?_____

20. Are there any needs that are not being served by these exchanges?_____

21. Imagine a different kind of exchange program for people, ideas, and resources: What would it look like?_____

22. What, if anything, is the U.S. government doing now in your country to assist the study of American history?_____

23. How available and useful are the programs of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA)? Be specific._____

24. What could the U.S. government do to assist the practice of American history in your country? Please give examples and

plain._____

. Does your own government assist you in the study of American story? Yes ____ No ____ How?_____

. Are there any structural impediments to the study of U.S. story in your country? For example, some Americanists abroad ve said that strict curriculum requirements in overseas iversities are a serious obstacle to the promotion of the study the United States, at least at the undergraduate level._____

rt IV: OAH As Clearinghouse

. What would be the most important elements of an American story resource clearinghouse that would try to connect people d institutions interested in resource exchanges? (The llowing list is far from comprehensive. Please check those at apply and add any other ideas that you wish.)

__ database of current needs and/or possible exchanges
__. regular publication of exchange opportunities
__ electronic mail bulletin board
__ research queries
__ curriculum materials

her _____

28. What else could the OAH do to foster scholarship on American history abroad?_____

29. How is information exchanged among Americanists in your country?

____ personal correspondence ____ electronic mail
____ local newsletters ____ government agencies
____ American studies associations

Other _____

30. Would you like to be part of an electronic mail network?____

Please return this questionnaire to:

Patrick Ettinger
OAH
112 N. Bryan Street
Bloomington, IN 47408
FAX: 812-855-0696

Please list the names of other individuals or institutions in your country/region that should receive this questionnaire.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

Institutional Affiliations of Domestic Respondents

American Council of Learned Societies
Anne Arundel County Public Schools
Auburn University
California State University, Los Angeles (2)
Duke University
California Western School of Law, UCSD
Calvin College
Claremont Graduate School
Cornell University
Garder College
Goshen College
Georgia State University
George Washington University
Historic Deerfield
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Immigration History Research Center
Indiana University
Kentucky Historical Society
Kentucky Humanities Council
Lake Forest College
Library Company of Philadelphia
Louisiana State University
Metropolitan State College of Denver
Miami University (Ohio)
Michigan Humanities Coucil
National Air and Space Museum, Smithsonian
National Museum of American History, Smithsonian (2)
New Jersey State Archives
New School for Social Research
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Old Sturbridge Village
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission
Pennsylvania Humanities Council
Pennsylvania State University
Pine Manor College
Purdue University
San Diego State University
Smithsonian Institution
Southern Illinois University
Stanford University (2)
State University of New York, Buffalo
State University of New York, Binghampton
Trenton State College
University of Akron
University of California at Los Angeles (2)
University of Charleston
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado
University of Florida

University of Georgia
University of Iowa
University of Illinois
University of Massachusetts, Boston
University of Minnesota
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
University of South Florida
University of Southeastern Louisiana
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Texas at Arlington
University of Texas at Austin
University of Tulsa (2)
University of Vermont
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia State Library and Archives
Washington State Archives
York College

APPENDIX E

Foreign Respondents by Country

Albania (3)
Australia (3)
Bulgaria
Canada (2)
Czech Republic
Egypt
England (5)
Finland (2)
France (5)
Germany (5)
Hong Kong
India (4)
Indonesia
Ireland
Israel (3)
Italy (2)
Japan (5)
Madagascar
Mexico (5)
The Netherlands (3)
New Zealand (3)
Pakistan
People's Republic of China (4)
Poland
Russia
Scotland
South Africa (3)
Sri Lanka
Swizterland
Taiwan
Ukraine
West Indies
Zambia